

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant notes that the priority document was not acknowledged in the Office Action (*see* cover page of the Office Action, under heading “Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119”). The International Bureau (IB) handles the submission of priority documents in National Phase Applications. Therefore, Applicant respectfully notes that, if the IB has not yet forwarded the priority document, the USPTO should request the same from the IB.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-15 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13-15 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-7 and 11-15 have been amended by way of this reply. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification. Claim 1 has been amended to replace “display means” with “a display device” (*see* paragraph [0036] of the published specification), “reception means” with “an external interface” (*see* paragraph [0037] of the published specification),

and “reproduction means” with “a central processing unit” (*see* paragraph [0035] of the published specification). Claim 2 has been amended to replace “reception means” with “a communication interface” (*see* paragraph [0039] of the published specification). Claims 3-4 and 6-7 have been amended to replace “printing control means” with “a printing control device” (*see* paragraph [0040] of the published specification). Claim 5 has been amended to replace “storage means” with “a recording device” (*see* paragraph [0034] of the published specification). Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Claims 13 and 14 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention (*see* paragraphs [0034]-[0053] of the published specification). No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings, noting that Applicant was required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81. During national phase processing, however, the drawings are transmitted from the International Bureau (IB). Applicant respectfully notes that drawings are not required if they are being forwarded by the IB. MPEP §1893.03(f) provides, “[t]he copy of the drawings provided by the International Bureau has already been checked and should be in compliance with PCT Rule 11. Accordingly, the drawing provided by the International Bureau . . . should be acceptable. The USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11).” Thus, the drawings were not required during this national phase, as the drawings filed with the international application comply with PCT Rule 11.

Nonetheless, a copy of the drawings is attached. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes the Examiner made reference to a two-month time period to respond to the drawing objection, although the cover page of the Office Action refers to a three-month shortened statutory period. It is assumed this reference to a two-month time period was in error. However, in the event a petition for extension of time is necessary, please consider this as such and charge the requisite fee to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04783/030001).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,129,934 B2 (“Luman”). Specifically, with regard to independent claims 1 and 13-15, the Examiner asserts that Luman “uses a plurality of touch-sensitive input/display tablets (terminal devices), which can include a predetermined drawing (background) that multiple users can mark up, with hand drawn markings, on the touch-sensitive tablets. . . . These mark ups are placed on and around the drawing, which can be displayed onto the tablets as well as being displayed through a projection means or CPU.” For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Luman discloses a collaborative markup projection system including a data projector and a plurality of touch-sensitive input/display tablets, the tablets permitting multiple users throughout a room to collaborate in creating a drawing or marking an image (see Luman, col. 3, lines 7-10). The system may include a computer input device to provide a preexisting image that

multiple users can mark up using the touch-sensitive input/display tablets image (*see* Luman, col. 3, lines 16-18). On the other hand, the claimed invention discloses a terminal device whereby handwritten input information can be accurately reproduced on a display. Luman's touch-sensitive input/display tablet, however, is distinct from the claimed terminal device as explained below.

Luman's touch-sensitive input/display tablet enables a user to enter hand drawn markings (markup data) onto images and/or drawings and to display images and/or drawings to the particular user of the touch-sensitive tablet (*see* Luman, col. 4, lines 15-19). Therefore, Luman's input/display tablet functions as both an input device whereby users can draw markings onto the touch-sensitive input screen and a display device to display the drawn markings (*see* Luman, col. 6, lines 38-39). The terminal device of the claimed invention, in contrast, does not function as an input means, but rather as a receiver (through an external interface) which receives handwritten input data from an external handwritten input device (*see* Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0034]-[0038] of the published specification). Because Luman's tablet is itself an input device, the tablet does not function as a receiver that receives input data sent from an external input device, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Luman does not disclose at least the limitation of "receiving handwritten data indicating the content of the notes handwritten on a paper medium on which the background image is drawn, the paper medium being placed on a handwritten input device which recognizes the content of notes handwritten on the paper medium," as required by amended independent claims 1 and 13-15.

In view of the above, Luman fails to show or suggest all the limitations of the claimed invention. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 13-15 are patentable over Luman. By

virtue of their dependence, claims 2-12 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04783/030001).

Dated: February 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By JP #45,079
Jonathan P. Osha *Thomas Scherer*
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Drawings (11 figures; 11 sheets)